

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10-27 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8, 12, and 23 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are sought to be amended. Claims 26 and 27 are sought to be added without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Allowed Claims

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowed claims 23-25.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1, [2, 4-7,] 8, and 10-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,526,147 to Rung. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 8, to expedite prosecution Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to include allowed subject matter from independent claim 23. In light of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 8, and the claims that depend therefrom (2, 4-7, and 26; and 10-11, and 27, respectively) are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider

claims 1 and 8, and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 and the claims that depend therefrom.

With respect to independent claim 12, the Examiner states that Rung substantially teaches Applicant's invention. The Examiner also states that Rung fails to teach Applicant's element of: "a plug capable of coupling to the microphone." The Examiner further states that:

A microphone having a various types of plug with a light emitting device coupled in the plug are common features of a microphone. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at [the] time the invention was made to modify the invention of Rung by implementing a plug with a light-emitting device coupled to a microphone for the purpose of enhancing the function of the [a] microphone apparatus to provide comfort to the user.

Applicant respectfully agrees that Rung does not teach Applicant's element of: "a plug capable of coupling to the microphone, *the plug having an enclosure with an asymmetrical opening* and a light-emitting device inside the enclosure to provide visual feedback to direct a speaker to stay within the sensitivity region." Not only does Rung not teach a plug capable of coupling to the microphone, Rung also does not teach "the plug having an enclosure with an asymmetrical opening" Although Rung shows an enclosure having an opening and a light source inside the enclosure in FIG. 6, the opening of Rung is symmetrical, not asymmetrical. The Examiner's statement that a microphone having a plug with a light emitting device coupled in the plug is a common feature of a microphone does not provide evidence of the plug having an enclosure with an asymmetrical opening. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a reference to show Applicant's element of: "a plug capable of coupling to the microphone, *the plug having an enclosure with an asymmetrical opening* and a light-

emitting device inside the enclosure to provide visual feedback to direct a speaker to stay within the sensitivity region.” Without a reference stating otherwise, Applicant believes that claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 13-22) are patentable over Rung. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 12 and the claims that depend therefrom be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 26 and 27 have been added. New claims 26 and 27 are identical to claim 3 and 9, which were cancelled in the previous Response.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: July 19, 2006

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/
Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026